

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/024,260	PRICE, ROBERT J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	F. Daniel Lopez	3745	

All participants.(applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) F. Daniel Lopez. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Naoki Yoshida (#48,108). (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 10 August 2005 .

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference  
 c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1,10 and 22 .

Identification of prior art discussed: Cobo et al .


Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i)☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**F. DANIEL LOPEZ**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the art rejection of all the independent claims. Adding --, throughout a whole range of the operator input-- after "wherein the relationships have a more gradual slope or curve as the speed of the pump is reduced" (e.g. claim 1 line 7-8) would overcome the art rejection of Cobo et al.